

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are now pending in the application. Claim 30 is added. Support for the addition may be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 39 and Figure 4, step 102. Claims 1, 21, and 28 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 34 and Figure 3, element 87. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15, 17-20, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Traynor (U.S. Pat. No. US 2002/0007278). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Traynor is generally directed toward a speech activated network appliance system. In particular, the Examiner relies on Traynor to teach that users are allowed to access and control remote appliances by telephone by passing a voice verification step and providing a password. However, Traynor does not teach a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a computer telephony system to access secure resources. In particular, Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being

operated by a user. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites in relevant part, "said verification/identification system is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual ones of said extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user." Independent claim 28, as amended, recites similar subject matter. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 34, and Figure 3, element 87. Thus, Traynor does not teach all of the limitations of the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traynor (U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0007278), in view of Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,219,793). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Traynor is generally directed toward a speech activated network appliance system. In particular, the Examiner relies on Traynor to teach that users are allowed to access and control remote appliances by telephone by passing a voice verification step and providing a password. However, Traynor does not teach a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user.

Li et al. is generally directed toward a method for using fingerprints to authenticate access to wireless communications. In particular, the Examiner relies on Li et al. to teach that a terminal ID (in the form of Caller ID) being employed by a caller is validated in addition to the caller's personal ID. However, Li et al. does not teach, suggest, or motivate a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a computer telephony system to access secure resources. In particular, Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites in relevant part, "said verification/identification system is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual ones of said extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user." Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 34, and Figure 3, element 87. Thus, Traynor and Li et al. do not teach all of the limitations of the independent claim. These differences are significant.

The differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the combination suggested by the Examiner are significant because the different associations of types of

biometric data and individual extensions allows for collection and use of different types of biometric data when different extensions are being employed. As a result, security procedures/levels of extensions can be varied based on the value of a secured resource accessible via a particular extension and/or functionality of an extension to receive or collect biometric data. This capability is not found in the Examiner's suggested combination, in which there is no indication or suggestion that operation of the verification is capable of varying according to the extension being employed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claims 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traynor (U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0007278), in view of Hoskinson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,339,351) and Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,219,793). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Traynor and Li et al., Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of claim 16.

Hoskinson et al. is generally directed toward an emergency response system. In particular, the Examiner relies on Hoskinson et al. to teach associating a plurality of extensions with a plurality of fixed physical locations and obtaining user extension information that identifies which one of said fixed physical locations the user is located in order to determine where a caller is located so that emergency assistance can be dispatched to the caller in need. However, Hoskinson et al. does not teach, suggest, or motivate a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure

storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a computer telephony system to access secure resources. In particular, Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a verification/identification system that is adapted to access a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user. For example, independent claim 21, as amended, recites in relevant part, "accessing a data structure storing associations among different types of biometric data and individual ones of said extensions in order to retrieve stored biometric data associated with an extension being operated by a user." Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph 34, and Figure 3, element 87. Thus, Traynor, Hoskinson et al., and Li et al. all fail to teach all of the limitations of the independent claim. These differences are significant.

The differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the combination suggested by the Examiner are significant because the different associations of types of biometric data and individual extensions allows for collection and use of different types of biometric data when different extensions are being employed. As a result, security procedures/levels of extensions can be varied based on the value of a secured resource accessible via a particular extension and/or functionality of an extension to receive or collect biometric data. This capability is not found in the Examiner's suggested

combination, in which there is no indication or suggestion that operation of the verification is capable of varying according to the extension being employed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Nov 21, 2005

By:

Greg Stobbs

Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/JSB/kup